

1
2
3 *E-Filed 6/30/09*
4
5
6
7
8IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION9
10 ARISTOCRAT TECHNOLOGIES;
11 AUSTRALIA PTY LIMITED; and
12 ARISTOCRAT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Case No. 5:06 CV 3717 RMW (RS)

13 Plaintiffs,

14 v.
15 INTERNATIONAL GAME
16 TECHNOLOGY, INC.; and IGT,
17 Defendants.
18

JOINT ORDER

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 THIS MATTER is before the Court *sua sponte*. Since March 30, 2009, counsel in this case
have filed no less than eighteen different letters addressed to the Court. *See* Letter of June 17, 2009
(docket entry [561]); Letter of June 17, 2009 (docket entry [558]); Letter of June 16, 2009 (docket
entry [556]); Letter of June 15, 2009 (docket entry [551]); Letter of June 10, 2009 (docket entry
[537]); Letter of June 9, 2009 (docket entry [534]); Letter of June 9, 2009 (docket entry [532]);
Letter of May 22, 2009 (docket entry [508]); Letter of May 22, 2009 (docket entry [507]); Letter of
May 19, 2009 (docket entry [501]); Letter of May 14, 2009 (docket entry [500]); Letter of May 12,
2009 (docket entry [494]); Letter of May 5, 2009 (docket entry [491]); Letter of May 1, 2009
(docket entry [488]); Letter of April 30, 2009 (docket entry [487]); Letter of March 30, 2009 (docket
entry [473]); Letter of March 30, 2009 (docket entry [472]); Letter of March 30, 2009 (docket entry
[470]).

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1 The letters have been submitted for a variety of reasons. They include updates submitted at
2 the Court's request as to what issues are still outstanding, proposed trial and pre-trial dates, requests
3 for hearings, requests to postpone hearings, and oppositions to all of the above. In one instance, the
4 letters separately requested both the presiding judge and the referral judge to rule on the same
5 sanctions motion, which risked wasting judicial resources and created the possibility of inconsistent
6 rulings.

7 The parties are reminded of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 7, which provides that "[a]
8 request for a court order must be made *by motion*. The motion must: . . . state with particularity the
9 grounds for seeking the order; and . . . *state the relief sought*." Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(b) (emphasis
10 added). In the future, the parties are cautioned that if they wish the Court to act, they must make a
11 proper motion in compliance with the federal and local civil rules, addressed to one of the judges
12 assigned to this case. Requests submitted in any other format will not be ruled upon. Absent
13 extraordinary circumstances, once such a motion is made, the parties should operate within the
14 constraints of the briefing schedule set forth in Section 7 of the Civil Local Rules. Departures from
15 Section 7 must be specifically authorized by the Court.

16
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18
19 Dated: 6/30/09

20 
21 RONALD M. WHYTE
United States District Judge

22 
23 RICHARD SEEBORG
United States Magistrate Judge